# Partnerships for Student
# Achievement Through Technology

# (PSATT)



## Competitive Technology Grants for High Need School Districts
## 2008-2010

# Application
# Table of Contents

# Partnerships for Student Achievement
# Through Technology

_____

# Competitive Grants 2008-09, 2009-10

_____

# Funded by:
# Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech)
# Title II, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
# as Amended by the
# No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001

| TIMELINE | |
|---|---|
| March 21, 2008 | Application posted on the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) Web site and announcements sent to all LEAs |
| March 26, 2008 | Audio Conference Technical Assistance - 1:30-2:45 p.m. Contact Lorraine Burns at loburns@mt.gov to receive conference logon details |
| May 16, 2008 | Applications postmarked by this date or received by the OPI by 5:00 p.m. |
| May 18, 2008 | Application Review Process begins |
| June 5-6, 2008 | Application Review Process -Technology Plan Review in Helena* *Technology Plan Reader identification form is enclosed- A minimum of two readers required per grant proposal submitted |
| July 1, 2008 | Grant Awards Announced |
| July 1, 2008 | First year of project funds become available to awardees |
| August 2008 | Mandatory Project Director and Partner Meeting Date to be determined, OPI 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. |
| September 30, 2009 | Last date to obligate funds (Year 1 funds) |
| This is a federal program and sub-grant reporting dates and requirements are subject to change as federal requirements change. | |

# General Application Information

*Who do we contact at the Office of Public Instruction for assistance?*

Michael Hall, Specialist          or          Lorraine Burns, Administrative Assistant
Telephone: (406) 444-4422                         Telephone: (406) 444-1852
Fax: (406) 444-1373                                Fax: (406) 444-1373
E-mail: mhall@mt.gov                              E-mail: loburns@mt.gov

*When are the applications due?*

Applications must be postmarked by May 16, 2008 or received by the OPI in person by 5:00 p.m. on May 16, 2008.

Applications should be sent by certified mail.

Return an original of the application and each technology plan and an additional two (2) copies of the application and each technology plan (total of 3 each) to:

Michael Hall, Specialist
Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

*Can the applications be submitted electronically?*

No. Original signatures are required on the application and electronic messaging may fail; thus, no

electronic submissions can be accepted (e.g., NO facsimiles, e-mails, disks or flash drives).

**REVIEW PROCESS**

The application review process for the grant narrative will consist of (1) an external review by a panel of educators experienced in reading similar grant proposals who will score the applications; and (2) a review by an OPI team that will make necessary policy decisions regarding the award.

Technology plan reading and scoring will be done by a team of reviewers involved in the application process.  As such, each proposal must also submit the names of two reviewers to assist in the review process.  The technology plan review process is an excellent professional development activity for individuals interested in improving their local technology plan and/or who plan on competing for technology-based grant funds in the future. Readers experience working in teams to review technology plans submitted with the PSATT grant applications submitted by Montana school districts.

The review process begins with training in the grant program, rating criteria, and an inter-rater reliability activity, followed by one and one-half days of technology plan  reviews (amount of time depends upon the number of technology plans to be reviewed). To ensure reliability in scoring, it is imperative that all reviewers participate in the complete review session that will take place in Helena on June 5-6, 2008.

<div align="center">

**Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology**
**Competitive Grants 2008-2010**
**Program Specific Information**

</div>

## ESEA Title II, Part D-Ed Tech

*What are the goals of the Enhancing Education Through Technology competitive funding?*

1) To improve student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in teaching and learning,
2) To improve the technology literacy of teachers and students, and
3) To improve the capacity of teachers to effectively and efficiently integrate technology into their curriculum and instruction.

*What is the focus of the Ed Tech competitive grants?*

Professional Development

The focus is upon professional development aimed at improving student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in teaching and learning. Proposals must focus upon the technology literacy of the teachers and students in the partnering school districts and the infusion (integration) of technology relevant to improving student academic achievement. The competitive grantees achieve that focus through the establishment of regional technology partnerships (including a partnership with at least one of the Montana Regional Education Service providers –see below) to assist targeted school districts.

For example, the Prime Applicant District and the participating eligible partner districts may identify a need to improve the use of multimedia resources in teaching and learning to improve student engagement and learning. In this scenario, needs assessments have identified that both teachers and students lack the necessary skills for achieving this goal and that the use of technology to increase student engagement in the learning process is low. The grant activities would target the development and implementation of the skills in both the teachers and students. The evaluation would look for an increase in the skills, application of the skills, student engagement in learning, and increases in student achievement that can be documented as a result of the professional development provided via the grant.

Partnerships

Partnerships with other eligible school districts and mentor partners strengthen the knowledge base, increase networking and increase the impact of grant funds. Proposals must include a partnership with the school districts, mentors, and at least one of the Montana Regional Education Service providers (see below).

Technology and Library Media Content Standards Awareness

Further, successful grants will develop and implement a model of professional development for informing grant participants (and potentially other teachers regionally or statewide) about the newly revised Content and Performance Standards for Technology and Library Media. The model must include a Level 1, and II framework. Level 1 (3-5 hours) introduces the revised standards, develops an awareness of the standards as they infuse across the content standards for all other curricular areas, and provides resources. Level II professional development (1 day minimum) provides on-going learning focused upon strategies for integrating the standards across the curriculum. Emphasis is placed upon creating, teaching and evaluating subject-specific lessons that exemplify best instructional practices.

## Eligible Applicant Districts

*What are the grant eligibility requirements?*

The NCLB legislation specifies that only Local Education Agencies (LEAs) eligible for the Title II, Part D program with the highest number or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line **and** are identified for improvement or corrective action under the ESEA Title I regulations or have a substantial need for technology and have not "redirected the use of-Reap Flexed or Transferred" their Ed Tech funds under the authority of ESEA Title VI, may apply for the competitive funds under this program.

Districts may participate/apply in only one proposal. Consult the attached district eligibility spreadsheet for district specific information.

Eligible Applicant Districts are identified by a "YES" in column 9 of the district eligibility spreadsheet.

**NOTE**: Many other districts will qualify as "Eligible Applicant Districts" that are not currently indicated as such on the eligibility spreadsheet. Potentially eligible districts are listed in column nine of the eligibility spreadsheet as "undetermined." The Office of Public Instruction does not have access to technology need data from the districts with which to make a final eligibility determination. Districts with high poverty may be able to demonstrate their technology need through the use of data from a variety of resources. Potential sources of need data documentation are:

✓ Teacher and student technology literacy assessments,
✓ Student achievement data correlated to technology use,
✓ Technology integration into the curriculum in the individual districts,
✓ Technology integration into the teaching of teachers in the individual districts,
✓ Student to computer ratios, and
✓ Technology use in the districts.

**Districts seeking to document their "substantial need for technology" in order to become eligible to apply as a Prime Applicant District or to be an "eligible applicant district" in a partnership must make their case in the proposal. Data from each of the partnering districts will be reviewed, scored, and the scores averaged to determine the proposal score.**

## Bonus Points

### Ed Tech Formula Grants
As required by the enabling NCLB statute, high poverty districts (Census data) that are awarded a formula grant allocation less than the average of the allocations received by high poverty districts in the state, must be given a priority in the competition. Identified districts will receive bonus points in the competition (see attached Eligibility Spreadsheet for district specific information). The bonus points of all districts involved in a proposal will be added to the final proposal review score.

### Professional Development Priority
Proposals allocating greater than 50 percent for professional development will receive bonus points in the competition (15).

## Partnerships

### *What are the Partnership requirements?*
Each application submitted by a prime applicant (lead eligible applicant district) must, at a minimum, include five partners. The partnership must include the prime applicant, at least three other eligible applicant districts (other than an elementary or high school district associated with the prime applicant district), mentor(s) and at least one Regional Education Service provider. Other partnerships with mentors may include, university teacher education program faculty, consultants and highly proficient technology mentors from other school districts. The purpose of the partnerships is to assist the high poverty/high need districts to improve teacher and student technology literacy and effectively integrate technology and improve student academic achievement.

Regional partnerships are encouraged to disseminate information and provide service to other identified high poverty/high need districts (see "Eligible Applicant Districts" below) in their region to assist them with professional development to improve teacher and student technology literacy and the effective integration of technology for the improvement of student learning (districts are encouraged to use their Ed Tech formula funds and/or local funds to purchase the service from the partnership network).

### Regional Education Service Providers
Montana Regional Education services are developing through funding and guidance from the OPI to improve student achievement in Montana schools by providing state support and funding for high-quality professional development. Potential roles for these providers include: internal evaluation, organization and dissemination of professional development offerings, and assistance in developing and/or dissemination of the Level I and Level II professional development model for standards awareness. Contact the providers by utilizing the information listed below.

Current Regional Education Services Projects

Western Montana Partnership for Educational Resources (WMPER) – Missoula
http://www.wmper.org/

Montana North Central Educational Service Region (MNCESR) – Shelby
http://mncesr.org/

Southern Montana Alliance for Resources and Training (SMART) – Billings
http://www.msubillings.edu/smart/

**Partnerships/Mentors Must Include:**

- ✓ Prime Applicant Districts must partner with at least three eligible applicant districts other than an elementary or high school district associated with the prime applicant district;
  - • Additional partnerships with "eligible applicant districts" are encouraged.
- ✓ Regional Education Service providers, and
- ✓ Mentor(s) who have demonstrated skills, knowledge, willingness and commitment to assist the project in meeting proposed goals and objectives.  Mentors' abilities can be demonstrated through:
  - • Participation in, or the creation of, researched and validated technology based professional development programs,
  - • Demonstrated proficiency with successful technology infusion (integration) across the curriculum, or
  - • Demonstrated proficiency with developing technology mentors, or data driven professional development models.

The quality of Partners and Mentors and their role in achieving the proposal objectives will be rated in the application process.

## Funding

*What is the source of the funds for the grants?*

The Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grants are funded through ESEA Title II, Part D - Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tech) of the Elementary and Secondary Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. As possible, the grants are to be equitably distributed between urban and rural school districts.

*How much funding is available for the grants?*

Congress has approved $625,741 for Montana during the current grant year.   Funds for the second year of the grants are anticipated to be approximately $613,000.

*How many grants can be funded?*

It is anticipated that three partnership grants will be funded. It is anticipated that the grants will range in size from $175,000 to $208,000. Final budgeted items and amounts will be negotiated with recipients.

*What is the funding period for the Ed Tech program grants?*

The Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grants are two-year grants with the second year of funding contingent upon the successful implementation of grant activities and upon availability of federal funds.

*What is the Funding Timeline?*

Grant funds for the first year of funding are available July 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009.  The second year of funding will be available July 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010.  No budget year extensions or carry over of funds are permitted.

## Approved Use of Funds

*Must an Ed Tech grant recipient use a portion of its funds to support specific types of activities?*

Yes.

Professional Development
Each Ed Tech grant recipient must use at least 50 percent of its funds to provide ongoing, sustained, and intensive, high-quality, job embedded professional development including mentoring; coaching; and peer observation.   The recipient district must provide professional development based on a review of relevant research, designed to achieve the grant objectives, in the integration of advanced technologies, including emerging technologies, into curricula and instruction and in using those technologies to create new learning environments.

Professional development must focus upon the technology literacy of the teachers and administrators (including the newly revised Technology and Library Media Content and Performance Standards) involved in the grant activities, by adapting or expanding applications of technology to enable teachers to increase student academic achievement, and technology literacy.  Activities must be based on the review of relevant research and may involve the use of innovative distance learning strategies.

Note: An indirect rate may only be assessed by the prime applicant district. Districts must have applied for, and received, the indirect rate in order to build it into their budgets.  Indirect rates must be applied for each year.  Thus, for the purposes of this application, the indirect rate must be the approved rate for the 2008-09 school year.  For information on indirect rates, contact Paul Taylor at the OPI, (406) 444-1257, ptaylor2@mt.gov.

Technology CADRE
The Montana Technology CADRE is provided through a partnership with the Organization for Educational Technology and Curriculum (www.oetc.org) and the Office of Public Instruction.  The CADRE meets three times per school year to provide participants with high quality professional development in the integration of new and emerging technologies into the teaching and learning environment.   Grant proposals are to budget for the participation of at least two teachers from the host district and each participant district.  For example, while Geyser Public Schools is technically two school districts (an elementary and a high school district) for participation in the CADRE the school system would count as one and would prepare to send two teachers to the CADRE professional development.  The CADRE typically meets one time in Helena, once in Bozeman and once in Billings.

Evaluation
Grant funds must support the services of an Internal Evaluator and an External Evaluation.

## Minimum Grant Score

Grants recommended for funding must score 70 percent or greater in the competition. Grants accepted for funding may require program and budget revisions before final approval and funding is released.

## Relevant Research

*What are the requirements for the use of "relevant research" in the application process and operation of grant programs?*

Applicants are required to summarize and cite the "relevant research" that supports strategies employed in the proposal for improving teacher and student technology literacy, integrating technology into the teaching and learning and improving student academic achievement.

Review criteria will focus upon:

- Clear identification of relevant research (technology integration, teaching strategies, professional development strategies, etc.),
- What the research indicates about the potential impact and effectiveness of the strategies, and
- The relationship between the researched strategies and the desired outcomes.

**What is "relevant research"?**

Defined in section 9101(37) of the NCLB act, scientifically based research involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs. For assistance in locating appropriate research, review the Web sites listed in the Recommended Resources section below.

## Professional Development

*What are the requirements for professional development?*

Professional development provided through Ed Tech funds is required to be ongoing, sustained, intensive, job embedded, and high quality. The professional development provided must be based on a review of relevant research.

A good source for information and research on professional development is The National Staff Development Council via the Web site at: http://www.nsdc.org/.

**NOTE: It is required that a minimum of 50 percent of grant funds be allocated for professional development.**

## Technology Plan

*What are the technology plan requirements for districts involved in an application for the Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grants?*

Under the NCLB legislation, any district that receives Ed Tech funds through the formula or the competitive portion of ESEA Title II, Part D, must have a new or updated long-range technology plan that is consistent with the objectives of the OPI Ed Tech technology plan (see OPI Ed Tech plan goals and objectives below) and that addresses the statutory local plan requirements (see Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric attached). All districts that have received formula funds under ESEA Title II, Part D through the consolidated application for federal funds have signed a statement of assurances to the OPI that the local plan has been updated to meet the requirements.

The Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric enclosed is structured to match the "Montana Integrated Technology Plan Framework" posted on the OPI Web site at http://www.opi.mt.gov/EdTech/Index.html. The framework integrates the technology plan requirements for the ESEA Title II, Part D –Enhancing Education Through Technology and E-Rate programs. It is recommended that districts submitting technology plans as a part of this competition structure their plans to match the evaluation rubric.

For the purposes of the Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology competitive grants, every district that is included in a grant proposal must submit their technology plan for review (see Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric for details on requirements). Each plan submitted must include the "Technology Plan-Page Reference Cover Sheets" (structured to match the Montana Integrated Technology Plan Framework) on which page numbers referencing plan sections are recorded. All technology plans will be reviewed and the scores obtained in the review will be utilized to obtain the total score for the proposal.

NOTE: Technology plans will be read in-state, by representatives from Montana school districts and the entities involved with the grant proposals.  Each proposal must be accompanied by the listing of at least two individuals who will be able to travel to Helena for the review of the technology plans submitted (see below for more details).

- ✓ Travel expenses will be reimbursed by the Office of Public Instruction,
- ✓ No reader will review any plan from a district that they are associated with,
- ✓ Technology plan review process is a professional development opportunity to learn about technology planning and the subsequent implementation of the plans,
- ✓ Training will be provided in the technology plan review process,
- ✓ Proposed dates for the review are June 5-6, 2008.

All recipients of Ed Tech funds must have a technology plan that is in compliance with the following federal regulations. Districts receiving Ed Tech formula awards have signed a statement of assurances to the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) that the requirements have been met. Districts applying for Ed Tech competitive funds must submit technology plans as part of the application process. Each plan must contain the following elements as required by federal regulations. It is recommended that districts submitting technology plans as a part of this competition structure their plans to match the Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric enclosed.

A.   A description of how the applicant will use ESEA Title II, Part D funds to improve student academic achievement, including the technology literacy of all students, and to improve the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.

B.   The applicant's specific goals for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement aligned with state content and performance standards.

C.   The steps that will be taken to ensure that all students and teachers have increased access to educational technology, including how the LEA will use funds under ESEA Title II, Part D with funds from other sources to ensure that:
   1.   Students in high-poverty and high-needs schools will have access to technology, and
   2.   Teachers are prepared to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.

D.   A description of how the applicant will identify and promote curricula and teaching strategies that integrate technology effectively into curriculum instruction, based on a review of relevant research, leading to improvements in student academic achievement.

E.   Provide ongoing, sustained, professional development for district staff to further the effective use of technology in the classroom or library media center (a minimum of 25 percent of grant funds received must be used for professional development).

F.   A description of the type and costs of technologies to be acquired under this funding including services, software and digital curricula, and including specific provisions for interoperability among components of such technologies.

G.   A description of how the activities provided with funds from this part will be coordinated with funds available from other federal, state and local sources.

H.   A description of how technology will be integrated into curricula and instruction and a timeline for such integration.

I.   A description of how the applicant will encourage the development and utilization of innovative strategies for the delivery of specialized or rigorous academic courses and curricula through the use of technology, including distance learning technologies, particularly for areas that would not otherwise have access to such courses and curricula due to geographical isolation or insufficient resources.

J.   A description of how the applicant will ensure the effective use of technology to promote parental involvement and increase communication with parents, including how parents will be informed of the technology being applied in their child's education so that the parents are able to reinforce at home the instruction their child receives at school.

K.   A description of how programs will be developed, where applicable, in collaboration with adult literacy service providers to maximize the use of technology.

L.   A description of the process and accountability measures that will be used to evaluate the extent to which activities funded are effective in integrating technology into the curricula and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach, and enabling students to meet challenging state academic content and performance standards.

M.   A description of the supporting resources (services, software and other electronically delivered learning materials, and print resources) that will be acquired to ensure successful and effective uses of technology.

N.   A description of how the local technology plan has been aligned with the goals and objectives of the OPI Ed Tech Technology plan.

**Goals and Objectives from the OPI Ed Tech Technology Plan**

Applicant's professional development plan must address each of the measurable objectives listed below through the locally designed implementation plan. Baseline and/or growth data must be collected annually. The Revised TAGLIT will be used fall of 2008 to establish a baseline, followed by administration in the spring of 2009 and the spring of 2010. Contact TAGLIT at 1-888-401-6950 for details and fee structure. The use of other assessment instruments is encouraged and may be utilized as appropriate.

**Strategies for Improving Academic Achievement**

**Goal Number 1**

**Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction**: All Montana teachers will be effective and efficient integrators of technology into their curriculum and instruction.

> Measurable Objective 1: One hundred percent (100%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Teachers' Technology Use in Teaching and Learning section of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2014.

**Goal Number2**

**Increasing the Ability of Teachers to Teach Utilizing Technology**: All Montana teachers and principals will be technologically proficient.

> Measurable Objective 2: One hundred percent (100%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Teachers' Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2014.

**Goal Number 3**

**Enabling Students to meet Challenging State Standards**: All Montana students will be technologically proficient by eighth grade.

> Measurable Objective 3: One hundred percent (100%) of students will rate themselves as a "3" or better as measured by the Students' Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2014.

## Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA)

*What are the grant requirements related to CIPA?*

> Districts must certify compliance via one of the following three avenues:
>
> 1) District receives E-Rate funding and has certified CIPA compliance to the E-Rate program, **OR**
>
> 2) District does not participate in the E-Rate program, however, hereby certifies that it is CIPA compliant, **OR**
>
> 3) District does not participate in the E-Rate program and the CIPA requirements do not apply because no funds are used to purchase computers used to access the Internet, or to pay the direct costs associated with accessing the Internet.
>
> Districts have certified CIPA compliance through signing the Common Assurances for Federal Programs in the Consolidated Application for federal funds in spring 2007 and will renew that certification when completing the application for 2008-2009.

## Nonpublic School Participation

*What does the equitable participation provisions of the law require grant applicants to do?*

Applicant districts and partner districts must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate nonpublic school (home schools and private schools) officials during the design and development of programs and continue the consultation throughout the implementation of these programs. Therefore, for the Ed Tech competitive awards, the consultation must begin during the development of the local grant proposals.

Nonpublic schools must meet the same eligibility requirements that participating districts meet. High poverty and high technology need status must be determined for participation.

## Application Format

**What are the format requirements of the Ed Tech Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grant?**

Applications may not exceed the total page limit of 30 pages, and must
✔ use half inch or larger margins,
✔ use Times New Roman, 12-point type,
✔ be double spaced, and
✔ include no more than 30 lines of type per page.

**Applications that do not meet format requirements will not be read nor rated.**

The following items **DO NOT** count against the page length requirement:
✔ Grant Application Cover Page/Signature Page (see below),
✔ Abstract (one page summary of grant proposal)
✔ Technology plans and the Technology Plan-Page Reference Cover Sheets,
✔ Technology need documentation from school district(s), and
✔ Documentation of the Quality of Key Personnel for the Internal Evaluation.

## Application Elements

*What are the required elements of the application?*

### Cover Page/ Signature Page
Complete the cover page/signature page (see enclosed at the end of the Application Elements Section) including signatures from the Authorized Representatives of the proposal school district partners (does not count against page length requirement). Include the cover page/signature page as the first page of the proposal package.

### Abstract
Enclose a one-page summary of the grant proposal (not included in the page total requirement).

### Goals and Objectives

1) Grant goals and objectives must detail the focus on the technology literacy of the teachers and students in the partnering school districts and the infusion (integration) of technology relevant to improving student academic achievement.

**Strategies**

Strategies must:

1) Increase teacher and student technology literacy (assessed by TAGLIT and other tools as proposed),

2) Integrate technology into curriculum and instruction,

3) Increase the ability of teachers to teach utilizing technology,

4) Enable students to meet challenging state standards,

5) Provide high quality, long-term, sustained, job embedded professional development (emphasis is away from one-time, short term awareness type activities),

6) Include a summary of relevant research that supports the proposed strategies. (What does the research indicate about the potential impact and/or effectiveness of the strategies?),

7) Development, implement and assess a professional development model for Level 1 and Level 2 model professional development on the revised Technology and Library Media Content and Performance Standards,

8) Develop a partnership with at least one of the Montana Regional Education Service providers and delineation of the role of the partnership in the grant activities (possible roles include: internal evaluation; and/or the professional development on the revised Technology and Library Media Content and Performance Standards), and

9) Target improvement of student academic achievement.

Appropriate strategies may include:
- Preparing an administrator and one or more teachers in a school/district to serve as technology leaders,
- Developing technology integration specialists in districts,
- Improving student academic achievement through research supported integration of technology productivity and research tools,
- Providing student-centered, inquiry-based, technology supported professional development and supporting the implementation in classrooms (Project Based Learning and others),
- Implementing programs such as: Intel Teach to the Future, Gen Y, or other research-supported technology based programs documented to improve the integration of technology into curriculum and instruction and lead to improvement in student academic achievement.

**Evaluation Plan – Internal and External**

Describe how the effectiveness of the grant strategies will be evaluated, including and going beyond the use of the baseline and growth data collected as an ongoing activity of the grant. Data collection (TAGLIT, OPTIC and locally determined tools) must be provided to allow for the analysis of progress toward improved student academic achievement, increase in teacher skill and technology use, effective integration of technology into academic content instruction, and other variables as appropriate to the grant and related school improvement programs. The grant proposals are expected to use the Thomas Guskey Framework (as adapted) attached as the basis for their evaluation plan for professional development.

Focus upon the:

- Increasing teacher and student technology literacy,

- Integration of technology into curriculum and instruction,
- Increase in the ability of teachers to teach utilizing technology,
- Increase in ability of students to meet challenging state standards,
- Provision of high quality, long-term, sustained, job embedded professional development (emphasis is away from one-time, short term awareness type activities),
- Relevant research that supports the proposed strategies, and
- Improvement of student academic achievement.

Allocate the grant budget to include the costs of Internal Evaluation as appropriate to the scope of the task. Internal evaluation is intended to be both formative and summative in nature. Describe how the evaluation information will guide the ongoing development of the grant operation. An internal evaluation report is required to be submitted to the OPI by

November 10, 2009, covering the first year of the grant operation, and by November 10, 2010, covering the final year of the grant operation.

Seven percent of the total grant request must be set aside for evaluation by an outside, external evaluator named by the state. The outside evaluator will work with the internal evaluator, the local evaluation plan and collect data for the statewide, summative evaluation of the Ed Tech program.

Role of the Internal Evaluator (include but are not limited to):

- Attend professional development and other grant meetings in order to understand and advise (formative) the grant directors on the implementation of the grant and the alignment of the activities toward to desired outcomes,
- Observe teachers in their classrooms implementing the strategies provided in the professional development offerings and utilize the OPTIC (http://www.netc.org/assessing/home/integration.php) observation tool to document current and evolving implementation of the technology skills,
- Develop or employ any assessments needed by the grant for the effective assessment and evaluation of the grant implementation,
- Communicate regularly with the grant director concerning the data collected, their analysis of the data and recommendations,
- Where needed, communicate with and share data with the External Evaluator via quarterly conference calls,
- Complete a quarterly summary (approximately one page in length) of the recent grant activities, data collected and analysis for the grant director and the OPI.

In the proposal, detail the qualifications of the internal evaluator selected for the project.

Role of the External Evaluator (included but are not limited to) – are included for information purposes:

- Observe the implementation of the grant activities through such activities as site visits and/or attendance at end-of-the year showcases or summits (summative evaluation),
- Communicate, at least quarterly, with the grant directors, the OPI and the Internal Evaluators to maintain currency with the grant implementation and gather and/or share data,
- Gather assessment data from the Internal Evaluators for use in guiding External Evaluation activities and in writing the summative grant report,
- Develop or employ any assessments needed to provide summative evaluation analysis and reporting to the OPI, and
- Complete a quarterly summary (approximately one page in length) of the recent grant activities, data collected and analysis for the grant director and the OPI.
- Submit a summative evaluation report to the OPI by November 10, 2010, covering the two years of the grant operation.

**Timeline of Implementation**
Articulate the general outline of the anticipated grant activities. Include significant project activities such as professional development and evaluation activities. While specific dates are not required, list the activities in a general timeframe of anticipated implementation.

**Budget**
- ✓ A minimum of 50 percent of the total grant funds must be allocated toward professional development. Proposals allocating greater than 50 percent for professional development will receive bonus points in the competition.

- ✓ Seven percent of the total budget request must be set aside for evaluation by an outside evaluator to be named by the state,

- ✓ Internal evaluation costs must be included,

- ✓ An indirect cost rate may only be taken by the prime applicant district,

- ✓ No funds received through this grant program may supplant local funds.

Note: Districts awarded ESEA Title II, Part D formula grant funds through the consolidated application for federal funds have signed a statement of assurances certifying that funds received under this part will supplement, not supplant, state and local funds.

*What information must be included in the Budget Justification?*

The budget justification must include, and clearly delineate, the costs associated with implementing the proposed strategies, required meetings and evaluation costs. Identify the linkage between each budget item and the strategy that it supports and provide necessary information to justify the expenditure. Clearly articulate the professional development expenditures and classify expenditures into the three general categories of: 1) Salaries and Benefits, 2) Operating, and 3) Equipment.

*Ed Tech Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology Award Recipient Meeting*

Districts awarded an Ed Tech Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology grant are required to attend grant award recipient meetings twice a year. At a minimum, one representative from each of the grant partners are required to attend (funded by the recipient's grant funds). The meetings will cover the basics of implementing the grant budget and strategies, the expectations for evaluation and data collection and will provide the opportunity for the recipients to meet with the outside project evaluator. The dates of these meetings will be determined after the grants are awarded.

*PSATT Joint Projects Statewide Showcase Special Project*

Grant writers are encouraged to submit an additional request for up to $10,000 (per year) to support the development and implementation of a Showcase designed to bring together the participants of the other funded grants. The purpose of the showcase is to increase the network of partnerships and to share knowledge gained throughout the grant operation. One proposal will be accepted from among the successful grant applicants. The proposal may be up to two pages in length (not counted in the maximum pages allowed for the grant proposal) and must detail how the funds will be spent to accomplish the purposes. At least $1,000 must be set aside to support the travel costs (mileage, food and substitute teacher fees –no stipends) of each of the awarded grants (anticipated to be 3 -3x$1,000=$3,000 set aside). The remaining funds may be used to secure meeting space, Internet connectivity, pay speakers fees and stipends and other regularly expected costs of producing a conference type event. The $10,000 special project award will be given each year to support the spring showcase. Participation by educators outside the PSATT grants is encouraged and may be charged a fee to attend. Such fees are expected to be utilized to support the implementation of the showcase. Showcase dates must not conflict with the CADRE meeting dates.

## Technology Plans

Every eligible school district participating in a PSATT grant request must submit their technology plan with the grant proposal. All technology plans will be scored and the score will be included in the overall score for the grant proposal (see rubric enclosed). The grant narratives will be read and rated out-of-state.

LEAs and eligible local entities must have long-range technology plans that are consistent with the objectives of the OPI Ed Tech Technology plan. LEAs must develop strategies for improving student academic achievement through the effective use of technology in classrooms, including improving the capacity of teachers to integrate technology into curricula and instruction. Furthermore, they must set specific goals, aligned with state standards, for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement.

To help ensure accountability for Ed Tech funds, LEAs and eligible local entities must also develop a process and accountability measures that they will use to evaluate the extent to which activities funded under the program are effective in:
1)      Integrating technology into curricula and instruction;
2)      Increasing the ability of teachers to teach; and
3)      Enabling students to meet challenging state standards.

***What are the requirements for aligning to the district's Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, ESEA
Title II, Part D formula funds and the local technology plans?***

Each district participating in a grant proposal must detail how the grant strategies align with, and help to achieve, the goals of their Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan (http://www.opi.state.mt.us/5YearPlan/Index.html) required by the Board of Public Education, their ESEA Title II, Part D (Ed Tech) formula funding and the district technology plan.

***Technology Plan Review***

Technology plan reading and scoring will be done by a team of reviewers involved in the application process. As such, each proposal must also submit the names of two reviewers to assist in the review process. The technology plan review process is an excellent professional development activity for individuals interested in improving their local technology plan and/or who plan on competing for technology-based grant funds in the future. Readers experience working in teams to review technology plans submitted with the PSATT grant applications submitted by Montana school districts.

The review process begins with training in the grant program, rating criteria, and an inter-rater reliability activity, followed by one and one-half days of technology plan reviews (amount of time depends upon the number of technology plans to be reviewed). To ensure reliability in scoring, it is imperative that all reviewers participate in the complete review session that will take place in Helena on June 5-6, 2008.

The Office of Public Instruction will reimburse participants at state rates for substitute teacher fees, mileage, meals and accommodations while in attendance.

Readers will not be assigned to read any technology plans associated with any grant that their district is involved in or with any technology plans for which there may be conflict of interest and thus create a problem with impartiality.

Enhancing Education Through Technology
ESEA Title II, Part D
No Child Left Behind
Competitive Fund Application 2008-2010

**Due Date**
**Postmarked No Later Than: May 16, 2008**
Send by certified mail.

Return an original of the application and each technology plan and an additional two (2) copies of the application and each technology plan to:

        Michael Hall, Specialist
        Office of Public Instruction
        PO Box 202501
        Helena, MT 59620-2501

| OPI USE |
| --- |
| District Name_____ |
| County Name_____ LE_____ |
| Page Length_____Postmark_____ |
| Format Requirements_____ |

*Original signatures are required on the application and electronic messaging may fail, thus,*
*<u>No</u> electronic submissions will be accepted (e.g. NO facsimiles, e-mails, or disks).*

**Program Goal**
The primary goal of the Ed Tech program is to **improve student academic achievement** through the use of the technology in elementary and secondary schools. It is also designed to assist every student-regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability-in becoming **technologically literate by the end of eighth grade**, and to encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum development to **promote research-based instructional methods** that can be widely replicated. Source: Guidance on the Enhancing Education Through Technology (Ed Tec) Program, U.S. Department of Education, March 11, 2002.

**Signature Information**
The Board of Trustees submitted a Common Assurances form to the Office of Public Instruction for the 2008-2010 school years, and no circumstances affecting the validity of the assurances have changed since its submittal. Further, the Board of Trustees has certified that the Common Assurances for Federal Programs and Specific Program Assurances for those programs in which this district/agency participates are accepted as the basic conditions for local participation and assistance in the operation of projects under this title.

| | OPI USE |
| --- | --- |
| Prime Applicant District _____<br><br>Signature of Authorized Representative_____ | ☐ Eligibility Verified |
| Partner Applicant District _____<br><br>Signature of Authorized Representative_____ | ☐ Eligibility Verified |
| Partner Applicant District _____<br><br>Signature of Authorized Representative_____ | ☐ Eligibility Verified |
| Partner Applicant District _____<br><br>Signature of Authorized Representative_____ | ☐ Eligibility Verified |
| Partner Applicant District _____<br><br>Signature of Representative_____ | ☐ Eligibility Verified |
| Partner Applicant District _____<br><br>Signature of Representative _____ | ☐ Eligibility Verified |

Copy this page as needed for additional signatures.

Partnerships for Student Achievement Through Technology
**Competitive Grants 2008-2010**
Prospective Technology Plan Reader Form
**(One form per person –two forms minimum from each proposal submitted)**
June 5-6, 2008

Montana Office of Public Instruction
1300 11th Avenue, Conference Room, Helena, Montana

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Name (Please Print) | | |
| Organization | | |
| Address | | |
| City | State | ZIP Code |
| Telephone | Fax | |
| E-mail Address | | |

Please refer to the information on the previous page and respond to the following statements:

1. ☐ In this competition, I, or my school district, have assisted in the preparation of a proposal and will participate in some way in proposed grant activities or have otherwise supported in the efforts to obtain grant funding for the following school districts:

   _____
   _____
   _____

2. ☐ I will participate in the technology plan reading activities. I understand I must be present both days in their entirety.

**PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM WITH THE GRANT APPLICATION POSTMARKED BY MAY 16, 2008**

**(If possible, to assist in the organizing of the Technology Plan review, send a separate copy earlier ) to:**

**Lorraine Burns**
**Accreditation Division**
**Montana Office of Public Instruction**
**PO Box 202501, Helena, MT 59620-2501**
**Telephone—(406) 444-1852**
**Fax—(406) 444-1373**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2008-2010 ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY ESEA TITLE II, PART D TECHNOLOGY PLAN - PAGE REFERENCE COVER SHEETS** (One set of cover sheets per technology plan submitted) | | | | |

District Name _____CO _____LE _____

| **Technology Plan Elements** | **Ed Tech Reference** | **E-Rate Reference** | **Technology Plan Page References** |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. Goals and Strategies for Use of Technology and Telecommunication | Ed Tech A, B | E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D | |
|    A. Goals (Multi-year, three years minimum aligned with state OPI Ed Tech Plan) | Ed Tech B | E-Rate 1C | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "1.A." |
|    B. Academic Achievement, aligned with 5YCEP goals | Ed Tech A, B | | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "1.B." |
|    C. Student and Teacher Technology Literacy | Ed Tech A | E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1D | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "1.C." |
| II. Strategies (realistic) | Ed Tech C, D, H, I, J, K | E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1C | |
|    A. Promotion of research based Curricula and Teaching Strategies that Integrate Technology | Ed Tech D | E-Rate 1A, 1B | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. A." |
|       1. Based on a review of relevant research | Ed Tech D | | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. A. 1." |
|       2. Aligned to Montana Content and Performance Standards | Ed Tech D | | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. A. 2." |
|       3. Proven to improve student academic achievement | Ed Tech D | | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. A. 3." |
|    B. Access for teachers and students | Ed Tech C | E-Rate 1A, 1B | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. B." |
|    C. Innovative instructional delivery strategies | Ed Tech I | | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. C." |
|    D. Timeline (three years minimum) | Ed Tech H | E-Rate 1C | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. D." |
|    E. Parent Involvement and communication | Ed Tech J | E-Rate 1A, 1B | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II.E." |
|    F. Adult Literacy and Adult Education | Ed Tech K | | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "II. F." |
| III. Professional Development (data driven, ongoing, articulated for a minimum of three years) | Ed Tech A, C, D, E, I, M | E-Rate 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D | |
|    A. Teacher technology proficiency | Ed Tech A, C, E | E-Rate 2C, 2D | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. A." |
|    B. Teachers technology use and integration | Ed Tech A, C, E | E-Rate 2C, 2D | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. B." |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| C. | Resources to support professional development | Ed Tech A, C, E, M | E-Rate 2A, 2B | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. C." |
| D. | Training in technology based delivery of specialized and rigorous academic content | Ed Tech A, C, E, I | E-Rate 2A, 2B | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. D" |
| E. | Other | | | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "III. E." |
| IV. Assessment of Needs (including inventory and replacement schedule articulated for a minimum of three years) | | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D | |
| A. | Hardware | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. A." |
| 1. | Compatibility with existing hardware | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. A. 1." |
| B. | Software | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. B." |
| 1. | Compatibility with existing hardware and software | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3B, 3C, 3D | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. B. 1." |
| C. | Telecommunications | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. C." |
| D. | Other services | Ed Tech F, H | E-Rate 3A, 3B | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "IV. D." |
| V. Budget (detailed for a minimum of three years) | | Ed Tech G, Ed Tech Guidance | E-Rate 4A, 4B | |
| A. | Demonstrated sufficiency to support the plan (total budget, explanation of expenditures) | Ed Tech G | E-Rate 4A, 4B | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "V. A." |
| B. | Document coordination of funds from all sources | Ed Tech G | E-Rate 4A, 4B | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "V. B." |
| C. | Document that federal funds utilized will supplement and not supplant (Ed Tech program requirement) | Ed Tech Guidance | | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "V. C." |
| VI. Evaluation and Accountability | | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | |
| A. | Analysis of student academic achievement data | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. A." |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B. | Analysis of student technological proficiency data | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. B." |
| C. | Analysis of teacher technological proficiency data | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. C." |
| D. | Analysis of teacher technology use and integration into curriculum and instruction data | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. D." |
| E. | Ongoing analysis of hardware, software, and telecommunication needs | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. E." |
| F. | Evaluation timeline including plan revision and school board approval | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. F." |
| G. | Compliance with Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) (E-Rate and Ed Tech program requirements) | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | SEE PAGE (S) _____OF THE ATTACHED PLAN. LABEL THE TAB FOR THAT SECTION(S) "VI. G." |

OPI USE: LE_____CO_____ District Name_____Reviewer Code _____

| ITEM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Proposal Abstract** | Not Scored | Not Scored | Not Scored | Not Scored |
| **Technology Need**<br><br>**6 Points Possible**<br>**3 x a weight of 2)** | Proposal does not have technology need data included. | Proposal includes generalized statements of technology need that are not supported by data.<br><br>Note: Each district in the proposal will be reviewed on the 0-3 scale for tech need. To achieve the average score for this section, the scores will be added and then divided by the number of districts. That score will then be weighted x2 and used to calculate the total score for the proposal. | Proposal includes clear statements of technology need that are supported by multiple and relevant data measures. Need data correlates with proposal objectives. | Proposal includes clearly detailed statements of technology need that are supported by multiple and relevant data measures. Need data correlates with proposal objectives and are addressed by the proposal objectives. |
| **Partnerships**<br><br>**6 Points Possible**<br>(3 x a weight of 2) | Proposal does not have partnerships beyond the school district partners included. | Proposal includes partnerships beyond the school district partners, however, the roles of each partner and benefits to the project are not clear. | Roles of each partner beyond the school district partners and the benefits to the project are clear. | Roles of each partner/mentor beyond the school district partners and the benefits to the project are clearly detailed and are integral to accomplishing the project. |
| **Quality of Mentors**<br><br>**6 Points Possible**<br>(3 x a weight of 2) | Mentor qualifications (mentors-at-large and others such as teacher education program faculty mentors) are not included or do not indicate special expertise related to the proposal objectives and activities. | Mentor qualifications (mentors at-large and others such as teacher education program faculty mentors) are included and indicate minimal expertise related to the proposal objectives and activities. | Mentor qualifications (mentors at-large and others such as teacher education program faculty mentors) are included and indicate expertise related to the proposal objectives and activities.<br><br>Mentor qualifications indicate capacity and willingness to assist the proposal achieve the proposed objectives. | Mentor qualifications (mentors at-large and others such as teacher education program faculty mentors) are included and indicate special expertise related to the proposal objectives and activities.<br><br>Mentor qualifications indicate strong capacity and willingness to assist the proposal achieve the proposed objectives. |
| **Strategies to Meet Objectives**<br><br>**9 Points Possible**<br>(3 x a weight of 3) | Strategies do not support the objective. | Strategies show some support for the objective. | Strategies clearly support the achievement of the objective.<br><br>Strategies are supported by research. | Strategies clearly support the achievement of the objective.<br><br>Strategies are supported by scientifically based research. |

| ITEM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Timeline**<br><br>**3 Points Possible** | Timeline is not included. | Timeline is vague and does not clearly outline the project activities. | Timeline details the project activities. | Timeline clearly and specifically details the significant project activities. |
| **Professional Development Strategies**<br><br>**6 Points Possible**<br>(3 x a weight of 2) | Professional development strategies do not support the objectives. | Professional development strategies support the objectives but are not aligned to the technology plan and/or Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan. | Professional development strategies support the objectives and are aligned to the technology plan and/or Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan. | Professional development strategies clearly support the objectives and show strong alignment with and support of the technology plan and Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan. |
| **Student Academic Achievement**<br><br>**9 Points Possible**<br>(3 x a weight of 3) | Proposal is not clear on how the project will improve student academic achievement through the use of technology. | Improvement of student academic achievement may result through the use of technology. | Improvement of student academic achievement will result through the use of technology. | Project utilizes scientifically based research strategies that will result in improved student academic achievement through the use of technology. |
| **Relevant Research Supporting the Strategies**<br>**6 Points Possible**<br>(3 x a weight of 2) | Research is not cited. | Research cited is anecdotal and not scientifically based.<br><br>Research does not clearly support the proposed strategies. | Research cited supports the proposed strategies and is scientifically based. | Research cited supports the proposed strategies, is scientifically based and includes multiple studies that support the strategies. |
| **Strategies for the Development Level I & II Professional Development on the Content Standards**<br>**9 Points Possible**<br>(3 x a weight of 3) | Proposal is not clear on how the project will develop **Level I & II Professional Development on the Content Standards** | Proposal provides some information on the development of the **Level I & II Professional Development on the Content Standards** but does not specify activities and a timeline. | Proposal provides information on the development of the **Level I & II Professional Development on the Content Standards** and specifies the activities and timeline. | Proposal articulates a strong, clearly detailed plan and timeline for the development of the **Level I & II Professional Development on the Content Standards**. |
| **Evaluation Plan**<br><br>**9 Points Possible**<br>(3 x a weight of 3) | Proposal does not articulate a plan for evaluation beyond the baseline and growth data required for the objectives. | Proposal articulates a limited plan for evaluation beyond the baseline and growth data required for the objectives. | Proposal articulates a detailed plan for evaluation beyond the baseline and growth data required for the objectives including student academic achievement, impact on teachers, administrators and parents. Proposal refers to the Thomas Guskey Levels of Professional Development. | Proposal articulates a strong and clearly detailed plan for evaluation beyond the baseline and growth data required for the objectives including student academic achievement and impact on teachers, administrators and parents. Proposal fully integrates the Thomas Guskey Levels of Professional Development into the evaluation plan. |

| ITEM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alignment:** **Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, ESEA Title II, Part D**   **formula funds and Technology Plans** **6 Points Possible** (3 x a weight of 2) | Proposal does not include information on how the Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula funds, and district technology plans support, or are supported by, the project. | References are made to the Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan, ESEA Title II, Part D funds and/or district technology plans but does not address how the project aligns with, and supports them. | Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula funds and technology plans are referenced with details on how the project aligns with, and supports them. | Five-Year Comprehensive Education plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula funds and technology plans are referenced with specific details illustrating the supporting relationship developed through the implementation of the proposal. |
| **Budget Justification** **6 Points Possible** (3 x a weight of 2) | Budget items are not connected to the project strategies. Budget does not indicate alignment with ESEA Title II, Part D formula and other NCLB funds. | Budget items vaguely connect to the project strategies. Budget indicates alignment with ESEA Title II, Part D and other NCLB funds but connection to project strategies is unclear. | Budget items support project strategies. Budget is aligned with ESEA Title II, Part D and other NCLB funds. | Budget items clearly support project strategies and are reasonable and sufficient to achieve the stated goals. Budget is clearly aligned with ESEA Title II, Part D and other NCLB funds and supports the project strategies. |
| **Quality of Key Personal for the Internal Evaluation** **6 points possible** (3 x a weight of 2) | Internal Evaluator qualifications are not included or do not indicate expertise related to grant evaluation. | Internal Evaluator qualifications are included and indicate minimal expertise related to grant evaluation. | Internal Evaluator qualifications are included and indicate appropriate skills and expertise in grant evaluation. | Internal Evaluator qualifications are included and indicate strong skills and expertise in grant evaluation. |

| Rubric Scoring | | | | District Name _____ |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 0 | Information is absent for the criteria | | CO _____LE _____ |
| | 1 | Information is incomplete for the criteria | | Date _____Review Code_____ |
| | 2 | Information provided meets or exceeds | | |

| Technology Plan Elements | Ed Tech Reference | E-Rate Reference | 0 | 1 | 2 | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I.** Goals and Strategies for Use of Technology and Telecommunication | Ed Tech A, B | E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D | | | | |
| A.     Goals (Multi-year, three years minimum aligned with state OPI Ed Tech Plan) | Ed Tech B | E-Rate 1C | | | | |
| B.     Academic Achievement, aligned with 5YCEP goals | Ed Tech A, B | | | | | |
| C.     Student and Teacher Technology Literacy | Ed Tech A | E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1D | | | | |
| **II.** Strategies (realistic) | Ed Tech C, D, H, I, J, K | E-Rate 1A, 1B, 1C | | | | |
| A.     Promotion of research based Curricula and Teaching Strategies that Integrate Technology | Ed Tech D | E-Rate 1A, 1B | | | | |
| 1.     Based on a review of relevant research | Ed Tech D | | | | | |
| 2.     Aligned to Montana Content and Performance Standards | Ed Tech D | | | | | |
| 3.     Proven to improve student academic achievement | Ed Tech D | | | | | |
| B.     Access for teachers and students | Ed Tech C | E-Rate 1A, 1B | | | | |
| C.     Innovative instructional delivery strategies | Ed Tech I | | | | | |
| D.     Timeline (three years minimum) | Ed Tech H | E-Rate 1C | | | | |
| E.     Parent Involvement and communication | Ed Tech J | E-Rate 1A, 1B | | | | |
| F.     Adult Literacy and Adult Education | Ed Tech K | | | | | |
| **III.** Professional Development (data driven, ongoing, articulated for a minimum of three years) | Ed Tech A, C, D, E, I, M | E-Rate 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D | | | | |
| A.     Teacher technology proficiency | Ed Tech A, C, E | E-Rate 2C, 2D | | | | |
| B.     Teachers technology use and integration | Ed Tech A, C, E | E-Rate 2C, 2D | | | | |
| C.     Resources to support professional development | Ed Tech A, C, E, M | E-Rate 2A, 2B | | | | |

| District Name |
|---|
| CO _____LE _____ |
| Date _____Review Code_____ |

| Technology Plan Elements | Ed Tech Reference | E-Rate Reference | 0 | 1 | 2 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D. Training in technology based delivery of specialized and rigorous academic content | Ed Tech A, C, E, I | E-Rate 2A, 2B | | | | |
| E. Other | | | | | | Not Scored |
| IV. Assessment of Needs (including inventory and replacement schedule articulated for a minimum of three years) | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D | | | | |
| A. Hardware | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D | | | | |
| 1. Compatibility with existing hardware | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D | | | | |
| B. Software | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D | | | | |
| 1. Compatibility with existing hardware and software | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3B, 3C, 3D | | | | |
| C. Telecommunications | Ed Tech F, H, M | E-Rate 3A, 3C, 3D | | | | |
| D. Other services | Ed Tech F, H | E-Rate 3A, 3B | | | | |
| V. Budget (detailed for a minimum of three years) | Ed Tech G, Ed Tech Guidance | E-Rate 4A, 4B | | | | |
| A. Demonstrated sufficiency to support the plan (Total budget, explanation of expenditures) | Ed Tech G | E-Rate 4A, 4B | | | | |
| B. Document coordination of funds from all sources | Ed Tech G | E-Rate 4A, 4B | | | | |
| C. Document that federal funds utilized will supplement and not supplant (Ed Tech program requirement) | Ed Tech Guidance | | | | | |
| VI. Evaluation and Accountability | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | | | | |
| A. Analysis of student academic achievement data | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | | | | |
| B. Analysis of student technological proficiency data | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | | | | |
| C. Analysis of teacher technological proficiency data | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | | | | |

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="5">
District Name _____<br>
CO _____LE _____<br>
Date _____Review Code_____
</td>
<td colspan="2"><strong>Technology Plan Evaluation Rubric – page 3</strong></td>
</tr>
</table>

| Technology Plan Elements | Ed Tech Reference | E-Rate Reference | 0 | 1 | 2 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D.     Analysis of teacher technology use and integration into curriculum and instruction data | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | | | | |
| E.     Ongoing analysis of hardware, software, and telecommunication needs | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | | | | |
| F.     Evaluation timeline including plan revision and school board approval | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | | | | |
| G.     Compliance with Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) (E-Rate and Ed Tech program requirements) | Ed Tech L | E-Rate 5A | | | | |

LE:_____ CO:_____ District Name:_____ Review Code:_____

| Completed Applications Must Include: | | Potential Score | Review Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| Signature Page | | Not Scored | |
| Abstract (Not included in page length requirement) | | Not Scored | |
| Optional-Statewide Showcase Special Project (Not included in page length requirement) | | | |
| Technology Need (Scores for each participating district / number of districts x 2) | | 6 | |
| Partnerships | | 6 | |
| Quality of Mentors | | 6 | |
| Strategies to Meet all Objectives | | 9 | |
| Timeline | | 3 | |
| Professional Development Strategies | | 6 | |
| Student Academic Achievement | | 9 | |
| Relevant Research Supporting the Strategies | | 6 | |
| Strategies for Development Level 1 & II Professional Dev on the Content Standards | | 9 | |
| Evaluation Plan | | 9 | |
| Alignment to Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan, ESEA Title II, Part D formula grant funds, and the District Technology Plan. | | 6 | |
| Budget Justification | | 6 | |
| Quality of Key Personal for the Internal Evaluation | | 6 | |
| Subtotal: | | | |

*Items included in the page length requirement.* (vertical text spanning the narrative rows)

| Technology plans from all participating school districts (each submitted with a "Technology Plan-Page Reference Cover Sheets"). | Potential Score | Review Score |
|---|---|---|
| Partner District #1 _____Score_____/4_____ <br> Partner District #2 _____Score_____/4_____ <br> Partner District #3 _____Score_____/4_____ <br> Partner District #4 _____Score_____/4_____ <br> Partner District #5 _____Score_____/4_____ <br> Partner District #6 _____Score_____/4_____ <br> Partner District #7 _____Score_____/4_____ <br> Partner District #8 _____Score_____/4_____ <br> Total Score from above _____ <br> Divided by # of plans required for the proposal - # of Plans _____ <br> Total Adjusted Technology Plan Score for the Proposal_____ | 8 | |
| Technological need documentation raw scores from the review process. <br> District 1 _____, District 2_____, District 3_____, District 4_____, District 5_____ <br> District 6_____, District 7_____.  Sum _____/_____number of districts x 2 = ____ | Are All Districts High Need? Yes/No | |
| Application Format/Page Length requirements are met? | Yes/No | |
| Bonus Points for greater than 50 percent of budget allocated to Professional Development. | Yes/No Points? ____ | |
| Bonus Points for included districts that received less than Average ESEA Title II, Part D Allocation in the 2007-08 school year. * <br> District 1 _____, District 2_____, District 3_____, District 4_____, District 5_____ <br> District 6_____, District 7_____. | 5 each per identified districts. | |

**Application Possible Points:**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Narrative** | **87 points** | | |
| **Technology Plans** | **8 points** | | _____ |
| **Professional Development Bonus** | **15 points** | | |
| | **105 points** | **+ Low Allocation bonus points*** | **Total Application Score** |

# Recommended Resources

**Metiri**, (http://www.metiri.com) *

"Looking to inform your decision-making about technology with sound, reliable research? Finding it difficult to locate research aligned to your interests, and even more difficult to know which research findings are significant and which are not?

Metiri Group's Technology Solutions that Work (TSW) database puts research at your fingertips, providing an in-depth, unbiased analysis of research on technology solutions and software designed for K-12 schools."

*Contact Lorraine Burns at the OPI for Log on information for Montana Educators (loburns@mt.gov or (406) 444-1853)

**CARET**, (http://caret.iste.org/)

"CARET bridges education technology research to practice by offering research-based answers to critical questions."

**What Works Clearinghouse**, (http://www.whatworks.ed.gov/)
"On an ongoing basis, the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) collects, screens, and identifies studies of the effectiveness of educational interventions (programs, products, practices, and policies). We review the studies that have the strongest design, and report on the strengths and weaknesses of those studies against the WWC Evidence Standards so that you know what the best scientific evidence has to say."

**Northwest Regional Education Laboratory –(NWREL),** (http://www.nwrel.org/index.html)

"The Northwest Regional Education Laboratory improves educational results for children, youth, and adults by providing research and development assistance in delivering equitable, high-quality educational programs. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) provides research and development assistance to education, government, community agencies, business, and labor

**Northwest Educational Technology Consortium (NETC)** - (http://www.netc.org/)

"The Northwest Educational Technology Consortium (NETC) has been providing services and products in the Northwest since 1995. The consortium is made up of the state education agencies from Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon. NETC is one of the network of 10 Regional Technology in Education Consortia in the U.S. and received funding from the U.S. Department of Education." Currently inactive, however the resources are still available.

Other Resources:
Powerful Designs for Professional Learning
Edited by Lois Brown Easton
National Staff Development Council www.ns.dc.org

Sit & Get Won't Grow Dendrites – Professional Learning Strategies That Engage the Adult Brain
Marcia L. Tate

Evaluating Professional Development
Thomas R. Guskey
Corwin Press, Inc.

# Levels of Professional Development Evaluation

Adapted from Guskey, Thomas R. *Evaluating Professional Development*
Thousand Oaks, CA:  Corwin Press, Inc, 2000

| EVALUATION LEVEL | QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED | MEASURE | WHAT IS MEASURED? | HOW WILL INFORMATION BE USED? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1**<br>**PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS** | • Did they like it?<br>• Was their time well-spent?<br>• Did the material make sense?<br>• Will it be useful?<br>• Was the leader knowledgeable and helpful?<br>• Were the refreshments fresh and tasty?<br>• Was the room the right temperature? | • Questionnaires or surveys administered at the end of the session | • Initial satisfaction with the experience | • To improve professional development program design and delivery |
| **2**<br>**PARTICIPANTS' LEARNING** | • Did participants acquire the intended knowledge and skills? | • Paper-and-pencil instruments<br>• Simulations<br>• Demonstrations.<br>• Participant reflections (oral and/or written).<br>• Participant portfolios | • New knowledge and skills of participants | • To improve instructional practice<br>• ***To demonstrate the impact of professional development*** |
| **3**<br>**ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND CHANGE** | • Were sufficient resources made available?<br>• Were problems addressed quickly and efficiently?<br>• Was implementation advocated, facilitated, and supported?<br>• Were successes recognized and shared?<br>• Was the support public and overt?<br>• What was the impact on the organization?<br>• Did it affect organizational climate and procedures? | • Minutes from follow-up meetings<br>• Questionnaires<br>• Structured interviews with participants and district or school administrators<br>• District and school records<br>• Participant portfolios | • The organization's advocacy, support, accommodation facilitation, and recognition | • **To document and improve organizational support**<br>• To inform future change efforts |
| **4**<br>**PARTICIPANTS' USE OF NEW KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS** | • Did participants effectively apply the new knowledge and skills? | • Questionnaires<br>• Structured interviews with participants and their supervisors<br>• Participant reflections (oral and/or written)<br>• Participant portfolios<br>• Direct observations<br>• Video or audiotapes | • Degree and quality of implementation. | • To document and improve the implementation of program content<br>• ***To demonstrate the impact of professional development*** |
| **5**<br>**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES** | • What was the impact on the students?<br>• Did it affect student performance or achievement?<br>• Did it influence student's physical or emotional well-being?<br>• Are students more confident as learners?<br>• Is Student Attendance improving?<br>• Are dropouts decreasing? | • Student records<br>• School records<br>• Questionnaires<br>• Structured interviews with students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators<br>• Participant portfolios | • Student learning outcomes<br>• Cognitive (performance and achievement)<br>• Affective (attitudes and dispositions)<br>• Psychomotor (skills and behaviors) | • To focus and improve all aspects of program design, implementation, and follow-up<br>• ***To demonstrate the overall impact of professional development*** |

The NCLB legislation specifies that only Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that meet criteria for poverty (yearly updated census data) and Title I status or technology need are eligible to apply. Eligible districts are encouraged to work together to apply for a grant.
Eligibility (column 9) is determined by:

**Poverty** – Those districts identified with a poverty level that exceeds the State average of 16.45 percent (column 3).

**AND**

**Redirected Use of Funds.** Districts must not have "redirected the use of" any portion of the district ESEA Title II, Part D, Ed Tech formula funds, utilizing the authority under ESEA Title VI of the No Child Left Behind legislation (column 8).

**AND**

**Title I.** Districts must be identified by ESEA Title I as in need of improvement or corrective action (column 6),

**OR**

**Technology Need.** Districts must have a substantial need for technology (see criteria in application package) (column 7) .

**Bonus Points.** (column 5): High poverty districts receiving an Ed Tech formula award less than the average allocation received by high poverty school districts, will receive bonus points on their application as per the NCLB legislation (see application package for more information).

| | Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 | Column 8 | Column 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **LEAs** | **Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty** | | **Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleID Allocation ($1776.07)** | | **Title I Status** | **Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)** | **Redirection Data** | **Eligibility** |
| Le | Name | District's Percent of Poverty | Is District's Percent of Poverty > 16.45%? | TitleID Allocation | Is District's TitleID Allocation > $0 and < $1776.07? | Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action? | Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology? | Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs? SY 2007-2008 | Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant? |
| 0861 | Absarokee Elem | 6.70% | | $337.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0862 | Absarokee H S | 5.45% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0577 | Alberton K-12 Schools | 24.54% | YES | $1,033.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0536 | Alder Elem | 21.95% | YES | $30.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0376 | Amsterdam Elem | 14.77% | | $1,046.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0236 | Anaconda Elem | 19.28% | YES | $4,760.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0237 | Anaconda H S | 16.51% | YES | $1,575.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0366 | Anderson Elem | 6.00% | | $259.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0474 | Arlee Elem | 23.45% | YES | $2,983.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0475 | Arlee H S | 17.93% | YES | $609.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1215 | Arrowhead Elem | 16.29% | | $1,032.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0800 | Ashland Elem | 23.65% | YES | $1,262.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0498 | Auchard Creek Elem | 25.00% | YES | $43.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0502 | Augusta Elem | 22.67% | YES | $938.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0503 | Augusta H S | 16.67% | YES | $30.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0720 | Avon Elem | 23.40% | YES | $463.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1218 | Ayers Elem | 0.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0785 | Bainville K-12 Schools | 29.31% | YES | $440.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0244 | Baker K-12 Schools | 9.97% | | $1,028.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0455 | Basin Elem | 25.58% | YES | $645.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0048 | Bear Paw Elem | 33.33% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0006 | Beaverhead County H S | 15.07% | | $1,627.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0076 | Belfry K-12 Schools | 11.65% | | $268.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0368 | Belgrade Elem | 9.40% | | $4,423.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0369 | Belgrade H S | 8.90% | | $865.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0112 | Belt Elem | 11.37% | | $726.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0113 | Belt H S | 10.34% | | $318.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0171 | Benton Lake Elem | 0.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0692 | Biddle Elem | 12.50% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0380 | Big Dry Creek Elem | 12.50% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0137 | Big Sandy Elem | 17.01% | YES | $518.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0138 | Big Sandy H S | 17.59% | YES | $396.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0865 | Big Timber Elem | 12.12% | | $907.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0330 | Bigfork Elem | 13.88% | | $2,018.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0331 | Bigfork H S | 13.30% | | $1,109.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0965 | Billings Elem | 15.09% | | $52,713.00 | | Yes | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0966 | Billings H S | 14.73% | | $10,879.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0789 | Birney Elem | 23.08% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0215 | Bloomfield Elem | 25.00% | YES | $23.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0968 | Blue Creek Elem | 5.41% | | $636.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0590 | Bonner Elem | 10.69% | | $775.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0456 | Boulder Elem | 20.38% | YES | $1,383.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0425 | Box Elder Elem | 21.67% | YES | $530.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0426 | Box Elder H S | 21.88% | YES | $20.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0350 | Bozeman Elem | 10.54% | | $10,594.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0351 | Bozeman H S | 10.04% | | $2,873.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0059 | Bridger K-12 Schools | 16.59% | YES | $1,114.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0705 | Broadus Elem | 13.29% | | $618.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0978 | Broadview Elem | 6.48% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0979 | Broadview H S | 17.95% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0782 | Brockton Elem | 42.34% | YES | $1,941.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0783 | Brockton H S | 36.96% | YES | $549.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0749 | Brorson Elem | 12.50% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0400 | Browning Elem | 38.05% | YES | $20,361.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0401 | Browning H S | 26.17% | YES | $4,466.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0840 | Butte Elem | 16.38% | | $18,694.00 | | Yes | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1212 | Butte H S | 15.40% | | $4,038.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0889 | Bynum Elem | 17.24% | YES | $30.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |

| | Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 | Column 8 | Column 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **LEAs** | **Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty** | | **Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleID Allocation ($1776.07)** | | **Title I Status** | **Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)** | **Redirection Data** | **Eligibility** |
| Le | Name | District's Percent of Poverty | Is District's Percent of Poverty > 16.45%? | TitleID Allocation | Is District's TitleID Allocation > $0 and < $1776.07? | Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action? | Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology? | Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs? SY 2007-2008 | Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant? |
| 0813 | Camas Prairie Elem | 18.18% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0969 | Canyon Creek Elem | 9.51% | | $691.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0458 | Cardwell Elem | 16.67% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0097 | Carter County H S | 9.46% | | $31.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0159 | Carter Elem | 16.67% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0101 | Cascade Elem | 12.40% | | $916.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0102 | Cascade H S | 9.94% | | $422.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0317 | Cayuse Prairie Elem | 11.24% | | $658.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0104 | Centerville Elem | 21.49% | YES | $1,571.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0105 | Centerville H S | 12.99% | | $313.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1205 | Charlo Elem | 25.00% | YES | $1,629.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1206 | Charlo H S | 23.64% | YES | $757.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1236 | Chester-Joplin-Inverness El | 15.02% | | $830.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1237 | Chester-Joplin-Inverness HS | 14.63% | | $561.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0028 | Chinook Elem | 28.14% | YES | $1,537.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0029 | Chinook H S | 19.38% | YES | $604.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0883 | Choteau Elem | 18.62% | YES | $1,680.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0884 | Choteau H S | 14.74% | | $575.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0547 | Circle Elem | 14.46% | | $771.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0548 | Circle H S | 15.12% | | $364.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0452 | Clancy Elem | 2.67% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0032 | Cleveland Elem | 20.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0595 | Clinton Elem | 18.53% | YES | $1,581.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0387 | Cohagen Elem | 12.50% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0796 | Colstrip Elem | 17.03% | YES | $1,209.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0797 | Colstrip H S | 11.92% | | $284.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0312 | Columbia Falls Elem | 18.99% | YES | $9,840.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0313 | Columbia Falls H S | 17.69% | YES | $4,006.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0848 | Columbus Elem | 10.34% | | $1,177.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0849 | Columbus H S | 6.47% | | $272.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0674 | Conrad Elem | 18.16% | YES | $1,511.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0675 | Conrad H S | 17.56% | YES | $464.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0617 | Cooke City Elem | 10.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0731 | Corvallis K-12 Schools | 20.94% | YES | $7,811.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0182 | Cottonwood Elem | 11.11% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0445 | Cottonwood Elem | 18.52% | YES | $307.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0359 | Cottonwood Elem | 6.06% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0316 | Creston Elem | 8.92% | | $304.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0777 | Culbertson Elem | 7.38% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0778 | Culbertson H S | 21.31% | YES | $102.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0192 | Custer County H S | 15.41% | | $1,520.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0975 | Custer K-12 Schools | 5.80% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0402 | Cut Bank Elem | 27.66% | YES | $5,166.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0403 | Cut Bank H S | 21.72% | YES | $1,345.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0740 | Darby K-12 Schools | 20.88% | YES | $4,048.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0424 | Davey Elem | 14.29% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0207 | Dawson H S | 12.73% | | $1,277.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1195 | Deep Creek Elem | 30.77% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1193 | Deer Creek Elem | 10.10% | | $386.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0712 | Deer Lodge Elem | 16.24% | | $2,776.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0307 | Deer Park Elem | 9.26% | | $324.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0264 | Deerfield Elem | 0.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0281 | Denton Elem | 14.12% | | $296.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0282 | Denton H S | 17.95% | YES | $22.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 9034 | Dept of Corrections-Youth | | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0592 | DeSmet Elem | 26.67% | YES | $1,512.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0005 | Dillon Elem | 16.71% | YES | $3,109.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0843 | Divide Elem | 9.09% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0809 | Dixon Elem | 37.93% | YES | $1,101.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0647 | Dodson Elem | 25.00% | YES | $594.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0648 | Dodson H S | 28.00% | YES | $38.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0419 | Drummond Elem | 16.67% | YES | $358.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0420 | Drummond H S | 23.40% | YES | $30.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0671 | Dupuyer Elem | 38.46% | YES | $1,227.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1235 | Dutton/Brady K-12 Schools | 14.05% | | $426.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0404 | East Glacier Park Elem | 25.29% | YES | $549.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0492 | East Helena Elem | 8.36% | | $2,291.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0073 | Edgar Elem | 17.50% | YES | $27.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0087 | Ekalaka Elem | 15.63% | | $730.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0972 | Elder Grove Elem | 9.57% | | $401.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0719 | Elliston Elem | 19.57% | YES | $312.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0981 | Elysian Elem | 21.88% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0546 | Ennis K-12 Schools | 8.94% | | $678.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0527 | Eureka Elem | 25.73% | YES | $3,285.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0339 | Evergreen Elem | 18.19% | YES | $3,302.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0890 | Fairfield Elem | 7.69% | | $242.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0891 | Fairfield H S | 11.67% | | $295.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0308 | Fair-Mont-Egan Elem | 9.77% | | $283.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0750 | Fairview Elem | 16.67% | YES | $801.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0751 | Fairview H S | 14.29% | | $30.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0259 | Fergus H S | 14.08% | | $1,094.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0853 | Fishtail Elem | 5.56% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0311 | Flathead H S | 14.54% | | $5,467.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0743 | Florence-Carlton K-12 Schls | 7.41% | | $1,255.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0790 | Forsyth Elem | 20.27% | YES | $1,272.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0791 | Forsyth H S | 16.54% | YES | $310.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0133 | Fort Benton Elem | 10.81% | | $549.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0134 | Fort Benton H S | 14.29% | | $370.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |

| | Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 | Column 8 | Column 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **LEAs** | **Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty** | | **Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleIID Allocation ($1776.07)** | | **Title I Status** | **Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)** | **Redirection Data** | **Eligibility** |
| Le | Name | **District's Percent of Poverty** | **Is District's Percent of Poverty > 16.45%?** | **TitleIID Allocation** | **Is District's TitleIID Allocation > $0 and < $1776.07?** | **Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action?** | **Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology?** | **Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs? SY 2007-2008** | **Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant?** |
| 0529 | Fortine Elem | 3.17% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0927 | Frazer Elem | 44.86% | YES | $2,912.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0928 | Frazer H S | 32.65% | YES | $770.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0599 | Frenchtown K-12 Schools | 7.60% | | $315.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0786 | Froid Elem | 26.67% | YES | $289.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0787 | Froid H S | 26.67% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0071 | Fromberg Elem | 17.04% | YES | $747.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0072 | Fromberg H S | 15.49% | | $360.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0774 | Frontier Elem | 22.06% | YES | $133.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0915 | Galata Elem | 13.64% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0364 | Gallatin Gateway Elem | 6.91% | | $295.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0614 | Gardiner Elem | 4.55% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1191 | Gardiner H S | 15.52% | | $271.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0378 | Garfield County H S | 16.18% | | $52.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0718 | Garrison Elem | 27.78% | YES | $23.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0153 | Geraldine Elem | 13.48% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0154 | Geraldine H S | 18.60% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0472 | Geyser Elem | 25.53% | YES | $38.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0473 | Geyser H S | 19.35% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1217 | Gildford Colony Elem | 14.29% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0926 | Glasgow K-12 Schools | 15.77% | | $2,632.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0206 | Glendive Elem | 14.03% | | $2,102.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0721 | Gold Creek Elem | 40.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0896 | Golden Ridge Elem | 19.05% | YES | $42.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0003 | Grant Elem | 25.00% | YES | $35.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0268 | Grass Range Elem | 19.35% | YES | $335.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0269 | Grass Range H S | 23.68% | YES | $36.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0098 | Great Falls Elem | 14.94% | | $43,693.00 | | Yes | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0099 | Great Falls H S | 14.72% | | $6,715.00 | | Yes | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0900 | Greenfield Elem | 11.94% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0872 | Greycliff Elem | 10.45% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0418 | Hall Elem | 15.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0735 | Hamilton K-12 Schools | 19.99% | YES | $8,200.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0023 | Hardin Elem | 32.50% | YES | $13,162.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 1189 | Hardin H S | 26.11% | YES | $3,100.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0030 | Harlem Elem | 27.12% | YES | $2,986.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0031 | Harlem H S | 24.70% | YES | $905.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0945 | Harlowton Elem | 12.90% | | $614.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0946 | Harlowton H S | 32.65% | YES | $804.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0543 | Harrison K-12 Schools | 14.18% | | $460.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0427 | Havre Elem | 18.28% | YES | $8,516.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0428 | Havre H S | 16.19% | | $1,292.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0078 | Hawks Home Elem | 15.38% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1213 | Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls | 39.21% | YES | $5,140.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 1226 | Heart Butte K-12 Schools | 37.98% | YES | $2,599.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0487 | Helena Elem | 12.75% | | $18,144.00 | | Yes | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0320 | Helena Flats Elem | 10.21% | | $399.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0488 | Helena H S | 12.27% | | $4,732.00 | | Yes | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0586 | Hellgate Elem | 10.52% | | $3,017.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0717 | Helmville Elem | 15.63% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0145 | Highwood Elem | 20.51% | YES | $375.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0146 | Highwood H S | 13.79% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0932 | Hinsdale Elem | 38.33% | YES | $1,199.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0933 | Hinsdale H S | 14.29% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0469 | Hobson K-12 Schools | 17.16% | YES | $562.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0814 | Hot Springs Elem | 40.14% | YES | $2,514.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0815 | Hot Springs H S | 25.42% | YES | $445.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0983 | Huntley Project K-12 Schools | 14.53% | | $2,900.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0923 | Hysham K-12 Schools | 14.96% | | $519.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0989 | Independent Elem | 6.83% | | $529.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0014 | Jackson Elem | 14.81% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0457 | Jefferson H S | 4.04% | | $257.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0060 | Joliet Elem | 12.78% | | $619.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0061 | Joliet H S | 11.11% | | $230.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0377 | Jordan Elem | 17.65% | YES | $52.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0948 | Judith Gap Elem | 46.55% | YES | $1,302.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0949 | Judith Gap H S | 40.74% | YES | $49.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0310 | Kalispell Elem | 11.63% | | $5,543.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0386 | Kester Elem | 100.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0323 | Kila Elem | 20.38% | YES | $1,216.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0272 | King Colony Elem | 12.90% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0187 | Kinsey Elem | 16.33% | | $30.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0173 | Kircher Elem | 9.78% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0161 | Knees Elem | 28.57% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0768 | Lambert Elem | 23.33% | YES | $781.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0769 | Lambert H S | 20.69% | YES | $42.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0792 | Lame Deer Elem | 43.74% | YES | $9,138.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 1230 | Lame Deer H S | 36.44% | YES | $4,482.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0367 | LaMotte Elem | 9.38% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0970 | Laurel Elem | 11.54% | | $3,721.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0971 | Laurel H S | 13.23% | | $1,758.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0411 | Lavina K-12 Schools | 38.33% | YES | $518.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0568 | Lennep Elem | 25.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0258 | Lewistown Elem | 16.48% | YES | $4,172.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0522 | Libby K-12 Schools | 24.20% | YES | $10,367.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1224 | Liberty Elem | 12.50% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0009 | Lima K-12 Schools | 27.00% | YES | $937.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0528 | Lincoln County H S | 16.93% | YES | $1,106.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |

| Le | Name | District's Percent of Poverty | Is District's Percent of Poverty > 16.45%? | TitleIID Allocation | Is District's TitleIID Allocation > $0 and < $1776.07? | Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action? | Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology? | Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs? SY 2007-2008 | Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Column 1** | **Column 2** | **Column 3** | **Column 4** | **Column 5** | **Column 6** | **Column 7** | **Column 8** | **Column 9** |
| 1221 | Lincoln K-12 Schools | 23.89% | YES | $2,346.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0216 | Lindsay Elem | 25.00% | YES | $79.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0612 | Livingston Elem | 13.40% | | $4,426.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0967 | Lockwood Elem | 13.73% | | $2,369.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0025 | Lodge Grass Elem | 37.93% | YES | $4,806.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 1190 | Lodge Grass H S | 34.30% | YES | $1,844.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0588 | Lolo Elem | 6.64% | | $1,305.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0741 | Lone Rock Elem | 17.76% | YES | $1,581.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0941 | Lustre Elem | 23.08% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1231 | Luther Elem | 9.62% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0370 | Malmborg Elem | 0.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0659 | Malta K-12 Schools | 17.57% | YES | $2,306.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0348 | Manhattan High School | 10.99% | | $676.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0347 | Manhattan School | 12.79% | | $1,304.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0341 | Marion Elem | 13.91% | | $420.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0530 | McCormick Elem | 25.00% | YES | $36.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0875 | McLeod Elem | 8.33% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0822 | Medicine Lake K-12 Schools | 17.82% | YES | $959.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0844 | Melrose Elem | 18.18% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0607 | Melstone Elem | 26.56% | YES | $592.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0608 | Melstone H S | 21.05% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0868 | Melville Elem | 16.67% | YES | $24.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0684 | Miami Elem | 22.73% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0172 | Miles City Elem | 16.64% | YES | $5,022.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0583 | Missoula Elem | 18.89% | YES | $36,325.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0584 | Missoula H S | 15.53% | | $9,966.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0852 | Molt Elem | 15.38% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0363 | Monforton Elem | 11.57% | | $590.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 9258 | Mont Sch for Deaf Blind | | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0460 | Montana City Elem | 6.25% | | $446.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0273 | Moore Elem | 16.67% | YES | $33.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0274 | Moore H S | 11.54% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0976 | Morin Elem | 16.42% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1222 | Mountain View Elem | 0.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0937 | Nashua K-12 Schools | 7.46% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1216 | North Harlem Colony Elem | 50.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1233 | North Star Elem | 11.54% | | $269.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1234 | North Star HS | 17.28% | YES | $186.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0811 | Noxon Elem | 20.13% | YES | $705.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0812 | Noxon H S | 14.39% | | $369.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0857 | Nye Elem | 5.88% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0342 | Olney-Bissell Elem | 16.28% | | $571.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0935 | Opheim K-12 Schools | 20.00% | YES | $347.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0375 | Ophir Elem | 2.86% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1239 | Ophir High School | | YES | | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0715 | Ovando Elem | 16.13% | | $29.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0808 | Paradise Elem | 32.14% | YES | $42.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0846 | Park City Elem | 11.11% | | $648.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0847 | Park City H S | 3.06% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0613 | Park H S | 13.21% | | $1,066.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0362 | Pass Creek Elem | 25.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0196 | Peerless K-12 Schools | 7.14% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0898 | Pendroy Elem | 25.00% | YES | $558.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0416 | Philipsburg K-12 Schools | 21.72% | YES | $1,466.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0620 | Pine Creek Elem | 18.75% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0385 | Pine Grove Elem | 12.50% | | $14.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0987 | Pioneer Elem | 11.70% | | $272.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0802 | Plains Elem | 29.35% | YES | $2,384.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0803 | Plains H S | 12.00% | | $387.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0325 | Pleasant Valley Elem | 23.08% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1214 | Plenty Coups H S | 32.79% | YES | $550.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0828 | Plentywood K-12 Schools | 10.42% | | $794.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0256 | Plevna K-12 Schools | 14.93% | | $50.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0012 | Polaris Elem | 20.00% | YES | $33.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0477 | Polson Elem | 19.70% | YES | $6,172.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0478 | Polson H S | 20.37% | YES | $1,508.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0775 | Poplar Elem | 46.51% | YES | $12,380.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0776 | Poplar H S | 36.40% | YES | $2,655.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0589 | Potomac Elem | 19.84% | YES | $795.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0706 | Powder River Co Dist H S | 11.11% | | $34.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0713 | Powell County H S | 15.20% | | $1,239.00 | | Yes | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0894 | Power Elem | 16.33% | | $36.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0895 | Power H S | 18.52% | YES | $20.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0021 | Pryor Elem | 37.14% | YES | $2,273.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0842 | Ramsay Elem | 14.52% | | $785.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0858 | Rapelje Elem | 16.22% | | $26.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0859 | Rapelje H S | 11.11% | | $14.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0754 | Rau Elem | 5.71% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0056 | Red Lodge Elem | 3.61% | | $408.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0057 | Red Lodge H S | 11.38% | | $423.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0850 | Reed Point Elem | 13.51% | | $491.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0851 | Reed Point H S | 8.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0015 | Reichle Elem | 18.18% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0227 | Richey Elem | 11.76% | | $30.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0228 | Richey H S | 17.65% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0069 | Roberts K-12 Schools | 7.30% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1207 | Rocky Boy Elem | 32.47% | YES | $7,462.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 1229 | Rocky Boy H S | 20.93% | YES | $834.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |

| | Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 | Column 8 | Column 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **LEAs** | **Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty** | | **Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleIID Allocation ($1776.07)** | | **Title I Status** | **Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)** | **Redirection Data** | **Eligibility** |
| Le | Name | District's Percent of Poverty | Is District's Percent of Poverty > 16.45%? | TitleIID Allocation | Is District's TitleIID Allocation > $0 and < $1776.07? | Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action? | Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology? | Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs? SY 2007-2008 | Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant? |
| 1199 | Ronan Elem | 26.31% | YES | $10,193.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1200 | Ronan H S | 17.66% | YES | $2,631.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0794 | Rosebud Elem | 21.15% | YES | $29.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0795 | Rosebud H S | 14.29% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0394 | Ross Elem | 33.33% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0605 | Roundup Elem | 25.84% | YES | $2,695.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0606 | Roundup High School | 23.67% | YES | $1,237.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0280 | Roy K-12 Schools | 11.58% | | $227.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0407 | Ryegate K-12 Schools | 19.01% | YES | $508.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1238 | S H Elem | 30.77% | YES | $8.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1203 | Saco Elem | 26.42% | YES | $589.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0657 | Saco H S | 15.63% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0392 | Sand Springs Elem | 12.50% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0747 | Savage Elem | 15.07% | | $295.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0748 | Savage H S | 8.33% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0194 | Scobey K-12 Schools | 14.08% | | $888.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0597 | Seeley Lake Elem | 12.64% | | $820.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0947 | Shawmut Elem | 28.57% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0910 | Shelby Elem | 10.88% | | $990.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0911 | Shelby H S | 11.83% | | $262.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0985 | Shepherd Elem | 18.51% | YES | $2,747.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0986 | Shepherd H S | 12.89% | | $481.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0537 | Sheridan Elem | 27.69% | YES | $1,252.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0538 | Sheridan H S | 13.41% | | $227.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1227 | Shields Valley Elem | 19.32% | YES | $1,213.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1228 | Shields Valley H S | 13.59% | | $448.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0745 | Sidney Elem | 12.45% | | $2,615.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0746 | Sidney H S | 12.05% | | $705.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0118 | Simms H S | 8.51% | | $495.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0324 | Smith Valley Elem | 18.06% | YES | $1,066.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0327 | Somers Elem | 15.16% | | $2,332.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0709 | South Stacey Elem | 9.09% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0288 | Spring Creek Colony Elem | 0.00% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0020 | Spring Creek Elem | 28.57% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0179 | Spring Creek Elem | 33.33% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0635 | Springdale Elem | 12.50% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0357 | Springhill Elem | 6.67% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0481 | St Ignatius K-12 Schools | 29.81% | YES | $7,602.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0582 | St Regis K-12 Schools | 28.09% | YES | $1,551.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0464 | Stanford K-12 Schools | 17.96% | YES | $1,048.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0732 | Stevensville Elem | 14.58% | | $2,600.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0733 | Stevensville H S | 14.17% | | $1,559.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1225 | Sun River Valley Elem | 12.96% | | $1,212.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0903 | Sunburst K-12 Schools | 19.14% | YES | $1,332.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0594 | Sunset Elem | 13.33% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0579 | Superior K-12 Schools | 19.43% | YES | $1,745.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0486 | Swan Lake-Salmon Elem | 10.81% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0309 | Swan River Elem | 17.16% | YES | $950.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0596 | Swan Valley Elem | 14.52% | | $208.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0882 | Sweet Grass County H S | 9.78% | | $346.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0593 | Target Range Elem | 7.38% | | $338.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0726 | Terry K-12 Schools | 16.67% | YES | $874.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | REDIRECTED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0804 | Thompson Falls Elem | 19.05% | YES | $1,530.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0805 | Thompson Falls H S | 26.51% | YES | $1,227.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0360 | Three Forks Elem | 5.82% | | $646.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0361 | Three Forks H S | 5.45% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0055 | Townsend K-12 Schools | 15.90% | | $2,567.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0177 | Trail Creek Elem | 28.57% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0534 | Trego Elem | 11.48% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0491 | Trinity Elem | 21.33% | YES | $1,478.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0807 | Trout Creek Elem | 31.82% | YES | $1,422.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0519 | Troy Elem | 31.00% | YES | $3,140.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0520 | Troy H S | 26.18% | YES | $1,366.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0044 | Turner Elem | 30.00% | YES | $395.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0045 | Turner H S | 30.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0540 | Twin Bridges K-12 Schools | 15.77% | | $786.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0131 | Ulm Elem | 14.63% | | $539.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1211 | Upper West Shore Elem | 11.11% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0679 | Valier Elem | 14.04% | | $358.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0680 | Valier H S | 28.05% | YES | $578.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0483 | Valley View Elem | 29.55% | YES | $706.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0127 | Vaughn Elem | 8.70% | | $359.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0738 | Victor K-12 Schools | 11.05% | | $1,350.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0566 | Vida Elem | 8.33% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0144 | Warrick Elem | 20.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1223 | West Glacier Elem | 8.33% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 1184 | West Valley Elem | 13.66% | | $1,271.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0374 | West Yellowstone K-12 | 9.31% | | $622.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0819 | Westby K-12 Schools | 20.41% | YES | $33.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0569 | White Sulphur Spgs Elem | 24.53% | YES | $1,253.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0570 | White Sulphur Spgs H S | 21.28% | YES | $448.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0334 | Whitefish Elem | 15.85% | | $6,202.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0335 | Whitefish H S | 16.22% | | $3,044.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0453 | Whitehall Elem | 16.06% | | $1,705.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0454 | Whitehall H S | 12.76% | | $557.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0663 | Whitewater K-12 Schools | 29.31% | YES | $704.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0506 | Whitlash Elem | 20.00% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0964 | Wibaux K-12 Schools | 10.59% | | $674.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |

| | Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 | Column 8 | Column 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **LEAs** | **Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty** | | **Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleIID Allocation ($1776.07)** | | **Title I Status** | **Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)** | **Redirection Data** | **Eligibility** |
| Le | Name | District's Percent of Poverty | Is District's Percent of Poverty > 16.45%? | TitleIID Allocation | Is District's TitleIID Allocation > $0 and < $1776.07? | Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action? | Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology? | Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs? SY 2007-2008 | Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant? |
| 0354 | Willow Creek Elem | 13.89% | | $263.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0355 | Willow Creek H S | 5.56% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0291 | Winifred K-12 Schools | 23.91% | YES | $818.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0642 | Winnett K-12 Schools | 17.78% | YES | $487.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0010 | Wisdom Elem | 13.04% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0007 | Wise River Elem | 21.05% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 0495 | Wolf Creek Elem | 9.68% | | $411.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0780 | Wolf Point Elem | 34.65% | YES | $6,713.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0781 | Wolf Point H S | 29.41% | YES | $1,873.00 | | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0591 | Woodman Elem | 8.62% | | $0.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0026 | Wyola Elem | 39.19% | YES | $983.00 | YES | Yes | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | YES |
| 0533 | Yaak Elem | 29.41% | YES | $0.00 | | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |
| 1196 | Yellowstone Academy Elem | 0.00% | | $1,943.00 | | | NO | UNDETERMINED | NO |
| 0034 | Zurich Elem | 34.15% | YES | $607.00 | YES | | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED | UNDETERMINED |

| | Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 | Column 8 | Column 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **LEAs** | **Poverty Data: Districts With Greater Than Average Poverty** | | **Bonus Point Determination: District Has High Poverty and Less Than Average TitleIID Allocation ($1776.07)** | | **Title I Status** | **Technology Need: (see application for criteria - districts must individually submit data to the OPI)** | **Redirection Data** | **Eligibility** |
| | | District's Percent of Poverty | Is District's Percent of Poverty > 16.45%? | TitleIID Allocation | Is District's TitleIID Allocation > $0 and < $1776.07? | Does District Have a Title I School In Need of Improvement or Corrective Action? | Is district High Poverty and have High Need for Technology? | Use of Ed Tech Funds Redirected to Other Title Programs? SY 2007-2008 | Is District Eligible to Apply for Ed Tech Competitive Grant? |